



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

February 7, 2003

Ms. Carolyn Hanahan
Feldman & Rogers, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2003-0850

Dear Ms. Hanahan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 176182.

The Pasadena Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all information provided to the Board of Trustees from October 30, 2002 through November 14, 2002. You advise that the district has released some of the requested information. You claim that portions of the remaining requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information deemed confidential by law. You indicate that the information at issue arose from a closed meeting under the Open Meetings Act (the "OMA"). A governmental body that conducts a closed meeting must keep either a certified agenda or make a tape recording of the proceeding, except for private attorney consultations. Gov't Code §551.103. The agenda or tape is kept as potential evidence in litigation involving an alleged violation of the OMA. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-840 (1988). Section 551.104(c) of the Government Code provides that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying *only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)*" (emphasis added). Section 551.146 penalizes the unlawful disclosure of a certified agenda or tape recording of a lawfully closed meeting as a Class B misdemeanor, and makes the person responsible for disclosure liable for damages to a person injured or damaged by the disclosure. Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988). In addition, minutes of a closed meeting are confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 60 (1974) (closed meeting

minutes are confidential under the predecessor to section 551.104); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 (1990) (minutes of a properly held executive session are confidential under the OMA); Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988) (providing that information protected under predecessor to section 551.104 cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request). However, records discussed in a closed meeting and records created in a closed meeting, other than a certified agenda or tape recording, are not made confidential by chapter 551 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 605 (1992). The information created by the superintendent reflecting the events of the closed meeting does not constitute minutes or a transcript of the meeting for purposes of section 551.104, and therefore, it is not confidential under that provision. As you claim no other exception for this information, it must be released.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You indicate that the information for which you claim section 552.107 consists of the district superintendent relaying confidential communications with attorneys to the district's Board of Trustees, and that these communications had been made by the attorneys in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon review of this information, we conclude that it is protected by the attorney-client privilege, and thus, may be withheld under section 552.107.

You also claim that the submitted documents contain information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.--Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5.

After reviewing the information at issue, we find that it does not constitute interagency or intraagency communications consisting of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Therefore, you may not withhold this information under section 552.111.

In summary, you may withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.107. The remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kristen Bates", with a stylized, flowing script.

Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/seg

Ref: ID# 176182

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Doris Barnes
4406 Sao Paulo
Pasadena, Texas 77504
(w/o enclosures)